

## ORMSS PUBLIC SCOPING ISSUES AND PLANNED ACTIONS

Comment	No.*	Action
<b>OHIO RIVER MAINSTEM SYSTEMS STUDY (ORMSS)</b>		
1) Study may overemphasize transportation and river commerce	1	Comment noted
2) Sufficiency of input from other federal agencies	1	Currently being addressed
3) Issuance of an official Record of Decision (ROD) for ORMSS	1	Will occur
4) Application of Ohio River Navigation Investment Model to ORMSS	1	Will occur
5) Relationship between ORMSS and completion of Olmstead L/D	1	Will be addressed
6) Integration of ORMSS with the U.S DOT Marine Transportation Study	1	Will be addressed
7) Sufficiency of public meeting notification process	4	Comment noted - Notification procedures being revised
8) Procedures for obtaining additional ORMSS information	1	Addressed in meetings
9) Date public scoping period ends	2	Addressed in meetings
10) How to get on mailing list for future meetings or follow-up information	2	Addressed in meetings
11) Use of Waterways Journal to communicate ORMSS information	1	Currently being addressed
12) Use of AWO and DINAMO to notify towing industry of public meetings	1	Currently being addressed
13) Interest in including major tributaries in project scope	3	Comment noted
14) How ORMSS study will affect Greenup L/D upgrade	1	Addressed in meeting
15) Need for ORMSS to address liveability issues of 2-for-3 (EMD) plan	1	Comment noted.
16) Inclusion of no-action alternative in ORMSS	1	Will be addressed
17) Effect an individual can have on ORMSS process	1	Addressed in meeting
18) Need for ongoing coordination & cooperation with concerned agencies & groups	3	Currently being addressed
19) USACE misrepresented intent of scoping meetings and should re-hold them	1	Comment noted - No Further Meetings Planned
<b>CUMULATIVE EFFECTS ASSESSMENT (CEA)</b>		
1) Tendency for CEAs to emphasize negative impacts	1	Comment noted
2) Need for CEA to consider more than navigation structures	3	Will be addressed
3) Need to learn from other CEAs	1	Currently being addressed
4) Interest in including a vision for the river in the year 2060	1	Will be addressed
5) Methods to be used for assessing water quality	2	Currently being addressed
6) Clarification of relationship between CEA and site-specific impacts	2	Addressed in meeting
7) Accuracy of models for predicting population growth & development	2	Will be addressed
8) Relationship between CEA findings and USACE actions	3	Will be addressed
9) Development of ongoing program to reevaluate cumulative effects every 5 years	1	Comment noted
10) How CEA is weighed against cost effectiveness of a project	1	Comment noted
11) Relationship between CEA and SIP product schedules	1	Comment noted
13) Importance of including commercial dredging & associated permitting process in CEA	2	Will be addressed
14) Need to adhere to Council on Environmental Quality's 1997 guidelines for CEAs	1	Currently being addressed
15) Need to consider 404 application approvals and resultant actions as direct USACE actions	1	Comment noted
16) Need to consider most operations of commercial navigation system as direct USACE actions	1	Comment noted
17) Use CEA as a guide in assessing the propriety of USACE projects	1	Comment noted
18) Interest in receiving an executive summary of the CEA	1	Comment noted
19) Interest in documenting CEA process and using the OR CEA as a model for other efforts	1	Comment noted

## ORMSS PUBLIC SCOPING ISSUES AND PLANNED ACTIONS

Comment	No.*	Action
<b>BASELINE CONDITIONS</b>		
1) Need to define, limit and establish parameters of baseline conditions.	10	Currently being addressed
2) Importance of coordination with resources agencies in determining baseline conditions	2	Currently being addressed
3) Need to define parameters for Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions (RFFAs)	3	Currently being addressed
4) Importance of understanding baselines for different environmental components	2	Currently being addressed
5) Will aquatic studies be performed for baseline condition or construction	1	Addressed in meeting
<b>BARGE OPERATIONS</b>		
1) Loss of shoreline trees and river property caused by barge activity	7	Will be addressed
2) Reliability of barge traffic forecasts	5	Will be addressed
3) Failure of barges to stay in designated shipping lanes	2	Comment noted
4) Increased spills and accidents potentially affecting aquatic life and impairing water quality.	1	Will be addressed
5) Changes in shipping demand as low sulfur coal reserves near depletion in next 25 years	2	Comment noted
6) Possible trash hauling by barges in the future	2	Comment noted
7) Difficulty in gaining access to Monroe Co., OH park property at Sunfish Creek near L/D 14 due to barge loading	1	Will be used & addressed under recreation
8) Why USACE expects only 1% increase in barge traffic, while a 3% increase in gross domestic product is expected	1	Addressed in meeting
9) Barges shine lights into residences.	2	Comment noted
10) OH Division of Watercraft receives many complaints about barges damaging shoreline near Greenup L/D	1	Will be addressed
11) Safety concerns related to uneven arrangement of barges on towboats	1	Comment noted
<b>NAVIGATION INFRASTRUCTURE</b>		
1) Navigation structures presently not keeping pace with traffic demands	3	Will be addressed
2) ORMSS schedule possibly lagging behind future navigation needs	5	Will be addressed
3) Clarification of scheduling and frequency of lock closures	1	Addressed in meeting
4) Eligibility of locks for classification as historic structures	1	Addressed in meeting
5) Possible issuance of bonds to fund navigation improvements	1	Addressed in meeting
6) View of navigation improvements as benefiting only shipping industry	1	Comment noted
7) Status of funding for John T. Myers L/D project	1	Comment noted
8) Assessment and documentation of Olmstead construction	1	Addressed in meeting
9) Why economic forecast model is based on use of auxiliary locks	1	Addressed in meeting
10) Has ORNIM (navigation investment model) been run on the system	1	Addressed in meeting
11) Status of Dashields L/D	1	Addressed in meeting
12) What are current cost estimates onlock extensions at John T. Myers and Greenup L/Ds	1	Addressed in meeting
13) Effects of Greenup L/D/ improvements on barge queueing	1	Addressed in meeting - will be included in CEA
14) What is priority of vessels at locks	1	Addressed in meeting
15) Support expressed for value & maintenance of OR navigation system	3	Comments noted.

## ORMSS PUBLIC SCOPING ISSUES AND PLANNED ACTIONS

Comment	No.*	Action
<b>WATER QUALITY</b>		
1) Cumulative effect of discharges to river may offset water quality improvements.	4	Will be addressed
2) Challenge to water quality presented by CSOs and SSOs	2	Will be addressed
3) High levels of mercury, arsenic, fecal coliform bacteria and agri-chemicals in surface water	1	Will be addressed
4) Need for more stringent discharge permitting procedures or moratorium on permits	2	Comment noted
5) Importance of coordination between USACE and OR public water suppliers	1	Will be addressed
6) Prolonged bureaucratic procedures in obtaining discharge permits	1	Comment noted
7) Possibility of implementing mechanical aeration in mainstem pools	1	Comment noted
8) Importance of continued water quality improvements as a high priority	1	Will be addressed
<b>GROUNDWATER</b>		
1) Overall effects of navigation structures and activities on groundwater levels	1	Will be addressed
2) Need to protect public groundwater supplies.	1	Will be addressed
<b>SEDIMENTATION</b>		
1) Mouths of tributaries silted in, impairing fish habitat, limiting access and damaging property	5	Will be addressed
2) In-stream sedimentation forming bars and causing vessel groundings	1	Will be addressed
3) Need to improve sediment and erosion control from public and private developments	1	Comment noted
4) Need for long-term plan to address silt removal and prevent future sedimentation	1	Comment noted
<b>DREDGING</b>		
1) Damage/destruction of mussel beds and fish spawning areas	4	Will be addressed
2) Possible use of dredge spoils to improve riparian or island habitat or for upland filling	2	Will be addressed
3) Impaired water quality & bioaccumulation in fish tissue of harmful substances stirred up by dredging	2	Will be addressed
4) Importance of maintaining shipping channel	2	Will be addressed
5) Potential partnering with private enterprise to remove marketable aggregates when dredging	1	Comment noted
6) Number of comments that were voiced about in-channel disposal	1	Comment noted
7) Habitat damage caused by Corps permitted commercial sand and gravel dredging		
<b>BANK/ShORELINE INSTABILITY</b>		
1) Bank undercutting & failure caused by increased barge traffic & queuing and wave action	7	Will be addressed
2) Bank erosion caused by USACE-controlled pool fluctuations	3	Will be addressed
3) Shoreline instability threatening costly restoration projects in wildlife management areas	1	Will be addressed
4) Severe erosion occurring at Slough Wildlife Mgmt. Area (downstr. from Henderson, KY)	1	Comment noted

## ORMSS PUBLIC SCOPING ISSUES AND PLANNED ACTIONS

Comment	No.*	Action
<b>POOL ELEVATIONS</b>		
1) Potential adverse effects of higher elevations on bridges, other infrastructure and property	6	Will be addressed
2) Pools maintained at higher level than agreed on in flowage easement contracts with property owners	2	Comment noted
3) Need for elevation management to prevent water levels from exceeding flood stage	1	Comment noted
4) Effects on recreation and quality of life of raising Montgomery pool level	1	Comment noted
5) Coordination of TVA and USACE on management of pool elevations below Tennessee River	1	Comment noted
6) Economic impacts if pool elevations change	1	Comment noted
7) Potential effects on siting of proposed Beaver County Industrial Museum	1	Comment noted
<b>LAND USE</b>		
1) Loss of significant farmland to urban development along river corridor	3	Will be addressed
2) Loss of green space & wildlife habitat with development of marina facilities	5	Will be addressed
3) Development of floodplains & wetlands resulting in increased runoff and habitat loss	4	Will be addressed
4) Need to develop comprehensive plans for development along river	3	Will be addressed
5) Need for coordination with community floodplain coordinators along river	1	Will be addressed
<b>RECREATION/FISHING</b>		
1) Need more public access ramps in each pool to reduce recreational crafts' usage of locks	5	Will be addressed
2) Degradation of recreational value of river caused by increased industrialization	2	Will be addressed
3) Health and safety concerns related to increased traffic and development	3	Will be addressed
4) Effects on fishing caused by water level fluctuations	3	Will be addressed
5) Underrepresenting of fishermen in ORMSS scoping process	1	Comment noted
6) Interest by Ohio to promote Ohio River as a vacation destination	2	Will be used under recreation
7) Increase in barge loading/unloading facilities limiting fishing access from shore	1	Will be addressed
8) Danger to recreational users of submerged trees toppled by bank erosion	1	Will be used under recreation
9) Need for examination of those licensed to operate recreational craft	1	Comment noted
10) Suggestion of greater use of levees for passive recreation	1	Comment noted
11) Increased development of scenic byways and bikeways	2	Comment noted
12) Effects on recreation and heritage sites in Illinois, including Tower Rock Recreation Area	1	Will be used & addressed under recreation
13) Include recreational facilities as design components of L/D revitalization & construction projects	1	Comment noted
14) Need for long-term plan for replacement & maintenance of existing recreational launch ramps	1	Will be addressed
15) Need more access ramps in each pool for emergency response and boating safety officials	1	Will be addressed
<b>FISH &amp; WILDLIFE</b>		
1) Need for fish habitat improvements, including fish passages around locks and dams	2	Will be addressed
2) USACE role when fish kills occur	1	Comment noted
3) Loss of wildlife corridors as shoreline develops	2	Will be addressed under land use
4) Stress and disruption of waterfowl migratory patterns caused by barge traffic	1	Will be addressed under aquatic resources
5) Loss of unique, sensitive species due to water quality problems and habitat modifications	2	Will be addressed.

## ORMSS PUBLIC SCOPING ISSUES AND PLANNED ACTIONS

Comment	No.*	Action
<b>THREATENED &amp; ENDANGERED SPECIES</b>		
1) Need for USACE to coordinate with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on these issues	1	Currently being addressed
2) Potential displacement of interior least tern from Cottonwood Island	1	Comment noted.
3) Riverfront development constraints related to endangered species	1	Comment noted
4) Effects related to 3 crayfish species, 2 fish species and 7 freshwater mussel species in IL	2	Will be addressed
<b>EXOTIC/INVASIVE SPECIES</b>		
Need to prevent distribution of exotic /invasive plants and animals through USACE actions	1	Will be addressed
<b>OHIO RIVER ISLANDS</b>		
1) Many islands posted for day use only	2	Comment noted
2) Concern that landowners must sell at USACE's price for OR Islands Nation Wildlife refuge	2	Addressed in meeting - not a USACE project
3) Potential instability of OR islands & futility of creating islands wildlife refuge	2	Will be addressed
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>		
1) Need to address the Native American Grave protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA)	2	Will be addressed
2) Need to contact state historic preservation offices when specific projects are proposed	1	Comment noted
<b>TRASH</b>		
1) Trash increasingly becoming a problem for property owners and river users	6	Comment noted
2) Need for stricter litter laws	1	Comment noted
3) Role of USACE related to litter and debris in river, especially at locks and dams	3	Will be addressed
<b>AESTHETICS</b>		
Impairment of scenic value of river corridor for millions of people living in the Ohio Valley	1	Will be addressed under aesthetics
<b>PRIVATE PROPERTY</b>		
1) Procurement and control of land by the federal government	3	Comment noted
2) Restrictions placed on property owners participating in federal programs	2	Comment noted
<b>ENERGY</b>		
Possibility of developing hydroelectric power at dams	5	Comment noted
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS</b>		
1) Need to increase funding for & improve enforcement of current regulations & develop new ones	2	Comment noted
2) Estimated number of officers that enforce shipping regulations along OR	1	Comment noted
3) Centralize enforcement efforts	1	Comment noted

## ORMSS PUBLIC SCOPING ISSUES AND PLANNED ACTIONS

Comment	No.*	Action
<b>INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES</b>		
1) Enhancement of river transportation capabilities through corresponding development/improvement of intermodal transportation facilities	2	Will be addressed
2) Need for long-range coordination with FHWA , state & local transportation agencies	1	Currently being addressed
3) Need to integrate navigation with other transportation modes	2	Will be addressed
<b>ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROGRAM (ERP)</b>		
1) How, when and where the ERP will be funded and implemented	7	Addressed in meeting
2) Clarification of relationship between ORMSS and ERP	6	Addressed in meeting
3) Understanding of what constitutes ecosystem restoration	2	Addressed in meeting
4) Potential difficulty in finding non-federal partners	2	Comment noted
5) Ability of partners to raise 35% local match for ecosystem restoration projects	2	Comment noted
6) Inconsistency of ERP with USACE's main objectives	1	Comment noted
7) Potential application of eminent domain in the ERP	1	Comment noted
8) Need for eminent domain in restoration of Ingram Island	1	Comment will be forwarded to ERP team
9) Clarification of relationship between ERP and treatment of municipal stormwater	1	Comment noted
10) Reason only certain construction activities are included in the ERP	1	Comment noted
11) ERP seems to favor projects outside Illinois.	1	Comment will be forwarded to ERP team
12) Will strategic planning for ERP occur	1	Comment will be forwarded to ERP team
13) Need to focus on riparian corridors & green space near power plants	1	Comment will be forwarded to ERP team
14) Importance of considering ERP in the ORMSS "future without project "condition	1	Comment noted
<b>OTHER QUESTIONS/CONCERNS</b>		
1) Clarification of difference between floodway and floodplain	1	LRL owes a response
2) Occurrence of site-specific mitigation for site-specific projects	1	Comment noted
3) Need for USACE to encourage uniformity in navigation charts along length of OR	1	Comment noted
4) Consideration by USACE of side-by-side amount and other enhancements separate from mitigation	1	Comment noted
5) Will USACE do site-specific environmental documents for each action	1	Addressed in meeting
6) What about ancillary movement of goods and services in emergencies e.g. bridge destruction	1	Will be addressed
7) Will USACE suggest different BMPs related to certain activities e.g. clamshell unloading	1	Comment noted
8) Effects on 4 Wild & Scenic Rivers proposed for Illinois	1	Will be addressed
9) Importance of continued air quality improvements as a high priority	1	Comment noted
10) Need for adequate financial resources to complete the mitigation requirements within the 401 certification program	1	Comment noted

\* Denotes total number of times comment was made during the scoping process.